

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 4-6 have been rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over Claims 2-4 of U.S. patent 6,700,687; Claims 7-8 have been rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,700,687 in view of Tachibe et al. Claims 1-3 and 9-13 have been indicated as being allowable.

In response to the foregoing, Applicants have elected to cancel Claims 4-8, without prejudice, and it is therefore submitted that the application as now amended contains only allowed claims.

Based upon a review of the application, it was determined that revision to the same was necessary for closer compliance with U.S. patent practice and procedure.

In view of the foregoing, an early and favorable Office Action is believed to be in order and the same is hereby respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier

Registration No. 25,599



James D. Hamilton
Registration No. 28,421
Attorneys of Record

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)
JDH/rac

I:\ATTY\JDH\240017US-AM.DOC